



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,048	08/18/2003	William F. Lauersdorf	FIB 0093 I2/14309	3112

51635 7590 07/01/2005

DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP
ONE DAYTON CENTRE, ONE SOUTH MAIN STREET
SUITE 1300
DAYTON, OH 45402-2023

EXAMINER

MUSSER, BARBARA J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1733

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/643,048

Applicant(s)

LAUERSDORF ET AL.

Examiner

Barbara J. Musser

Art Unit

1733

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/17/03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-19, drawn to a method of making a composite, classified in class 156, subclass 285.
 - II. Claims 20-22, drawn to a composite, classified in class 428, subclass 480.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made in a different method such as forming the composite without the gel coat and then applying the material forming the gel coat afterward to the finished article.
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
4. During a telephone conversation with Patricia Prior on 5/11/05 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-19. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 20-22 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Art Unit: 1733

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5, 9-11, 13-15, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campanella et al.(U.S. Patent 5,900,311) in view of Parish(U.S. Patent 5,843,221)

Campanella et al. discloses a method of making a composite by applying a gel coat to a mold, partially curing it, applying a skin laminate to the gel coat, applying fiber reinforcement over the skin coating, closing the mold, applying resin to the fiber reinforcement, curing the resin, opening the mold and removing the composite.(Col. 6, ll. 5-29) The skin laminate is typically made of vinyl esters or vinyl esters mixed with unsaturated polyesters with a high fiber content.(Col. 5, ll. 40-45) The reference does not disclose the specific composition used to make the skin laminate. Parish discloses a composition containing 40-42% vinyl ester, 30-36% polyester, 0-40% monomer, 1-

Art Unit: 1733

15% thickener, 0-2% accelerator, 5-35% filler, and 0-50% catalyst.(Col. 2, ll. 52- Col. 3, ll. 15; Col. 3, ll. 61-63) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the composition of Parish as the skin laminate of Campanella et al. since the composition uses a minimum of volatile solvents and can enhance the surface appearance of composites(Col. 3, ll. 20-42) which is desired by Campanella et al. which discloses that the purpose of skin laminates is to improve the surface smoothness of the product.(Col. 5, ll. 32-33) Since the composition of Parish is the same as that of applicant, it would have the same effect, namely causing the composite to have an improved surface finish.

Regarding claim 2, since the mold can be closed, one in the art would understand that it would be composed of at least two parts.(Col. 6, ll. 10-11)

Regarding claim 3, the application of pressure to the mold appears to be well-known and conventional in general in the composite arts and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply pressure to the mold since such is well-known and conventional in the composite arts.

Regarding claim 4, since the resin is injected under vacuum, one in the art would appreciate that pressure would be applied to the resin to cause it to flow into the mold.(Col. 6, ll. 11)

Regarding claim 5, since the entire process occurs under a vacuum, one in the art would understand that a vacuum was applied.(Col. 6, ll. 25)

Regarding claim 9, the closed mold process is a resin transfer molding process.(Col. 5, ll. 7)

Art Unit: 1733

Regarding claim 10, Parish discloses the accelerator is copper naphthanate.(Col. 2, ll. 60-61)

Regarding claim 11, while Parish does not disclose the specific fillers claimed, it is clear that conventional fillers can be used. Campanella et al. discloses that conventional fillers include mica.(Col. 4, ll. 48) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use any conventional filler in the composition of Parish in the process of Campanella et al. since they are well-known and conventional fillers and since Campanella et al. discloses mica is an alternative to talc, used in Parish.(Col. 4, ll. 48)

Regarding claim 13, Parish discloses a thixotropic clay.(Col. 2, ll. 58)

Regarding claims 14 and 17, Parish discloses the composition can contain 0-1% fumed silica.(Col. 4, ll. 46)

Regarding claim 15, Parish discloses the catalyst can be methyl ethyl ketone peroxide.(Col. 3, ll. 5)

Regarding claims 18 and 19, the addition of a second layer of fiberglass, resin, and skin laminate appear to be well-known and conventional in the art and it would have been obvious to use a second layer of fiberglass ,resin, and skin laminate since such as well-known and conventional in the composite arts.

8. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Haraldsson et al.(U.S. Patent 6,558,608)

The references cited above do not disclose using a vacuum bag to form a vacuum in the mold. Haraldsson et al. discloses a method of forming composite articles by applying the layers and then applying a vacuum bag to the mold (Col. 1, ll. 67-Col. 2, ll. 1; Col. 2, ll. 47-48) in a vacuum assisted resin transfer process, the same type of process as that of Campanella. (Col. 5, ll. 7) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a vacuum bag to apply a vacuum in the process of Campanella et al. and Parish since they do not disclose how the vacuum is applied and since Haraldsson et al. shows it is a well-known and conventional method of applying a vacuum to composite fiberglass articles in the same type of process as that of Campanella et al. (Col. 1, ll. 67- Col. 2, ll. 47-48)

9. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Kia et al. (U.S. Publication 2004/0038059).

The references cited above do not disclose the filler being hollow microspheres. Kia et al. discloses a method of making a composite using a gel coat, skin laminate (barrier coating), and fiberglass layer impregnated with resin wherein hollow glass microspheres are used as a filler in the skin laminate to reduce the density. (Abstract; [0031]-[0032]) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use hollow glass microspheres as the filler in the skin laminate of Campanella et al. and Parish since this would reduce the density of the final product ([0031]).

Art Unit: 1733

10. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campanella et al. and Comstock et al.(U.S. Patent 4,288,571).

Campanella et al. discloses a method of making a composite by applying a gel coat to a mold, partially curing it, applying a skin laminate to the gel coat, applying fiber reinforcement over the skin coating, closing the mold, applying resin to the fiber reinforcement, curing the resin, opening the mold and removing the composite.(Col. 6, ll. 5-29) The skin laminate is typically made of vinyl esters or vinyl esters mixed with unsaturated polyesters with a high fiber content.(Col. 5, ll. 40-45) The reference does not disclose the specific composition used to make the skin laminate. Comstock et al. discloses a molding composition containing an unsaturated polyester, vinyl ester, monomer, fillers, thickener, and accelerator.(Col. 1, ll. 57-64; Col. 5, ll. 32-33; Col. 6, ll. 3-8, 30-35, 52-53) The composition can be used to form attractive thermoset articles which are receptive to paint.(Col. 1, ll. 15-24) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the composition of Comstock et al. as the skin laminate of Campanella et al. since Campanella et al. discloses that conventionally skin laminates contain vinyl ester/unsaturated polyester mixes with high amounts of fibers, and since it can have excellent surface properties and smoothness(Col. 1, ll. 20-21) which is desired by Campanella et al. which discloses that the purpose of skin laminates is to improve the surface smoothness of the product.(Col. 5, ll. 32-33) Since the composition of Comstock et al. is the same as that of applicant, it would have the same effect, namely causing the composite to have an improved surface finish. While Comstock et al. states the percentages in terms of parts

Art Unit: 1733

by weight polyester, a conversion shows that Comstock et al. discloses 14-85% polyester, 1-42% vinyl ester, 9.4-58% monomer, 0.4-39% thickener, 2-73% filler, and 0.7-4% accelerator.(Col. 1, ll. 59-62; Col. 6, ll. 4-6, 27-30, 33-35, 52-55).

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara J. Musser whose telephone number is (571) 272-1222. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday; alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Blaine Copenheaver can be reached on (571)-272-1156. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



BJM



JEFF H. AFTERGUT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1300